UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,368	02/14/2001	Robert Michael Getler	2000-0168.00	2311

21972	7590	05/21/2004

LEXMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
740 WEST NEW CIRCLE ROAD
BLDG. 082-1
LEXINGTON, KY 40550-0999

EXAMINER
HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	4

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 June 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2,3*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on 6/18/02.

2.   Claims 1 – 15 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, and 12 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 1 – 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

5.   **Regarding independent claim 1**, it is unclear what applicant means by

"satellite". Consequently, all subsequent recitations of "satellite" are also rejected.

6.   **Regarding dependent claims 2 – 5**, the claims are rejected for fully

incorporating the deficiencies of the base claim(s) from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1 – 5 and 12 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Rourke et al. (as cited by applicant).

9.   **Regarding independent claim 1**, Rourke et al. teach that *clients provide the*

electronic documents that are the source of the print jobs and for this purpose individual

ones or all of clients may have a document scanner, disk input, keyboard, fax, etc. for

generating the electronic documents that comprise the job to be printed (Column 7,

lines 2 – 7), which provide for **a plurality of input sources; a plurality of satellite**

servers connected to said input sources, said satellite servers being configured

to receive a plurality of digital files from said input sources. Rourke et al. also

teach that *system provides print processing for various workstations or clients. Clients,*

which may be remote and/or on site, are operatively coupled to printers through server

(Column 6, line 60 – 64), which provide for **a central server connected to said**

satellite servers, said central server being configured to receive said digital files

from said satellite servers and perform at least one action on at least one of said

digital files. Although, Rourke et al. do not explicitly teach **satellite servers** or a

central server, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to be motivated to interpret and/or employ a central server in

conjunction with Rourke et al. since Fig 1 illustrates one main server to which the clients

must connect in order to fulfill their print job requests. As for the **satellite servers**, the

clients mentioned in the teachings of Rourke et al. can be interpreted as such servers,

since Netlingo teaches that *with the advent of powerful individual workstations, most*

computers can act as both client and server in different situations (<netlingo.com>).

10.   **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Rourke et al., in his discussion of prior art points

out that *the advantage of using one or more queues in a printing process has been*

demonstrated ... **[the prior art]** *discloses a system in which copy/print jobs are*

delivered to an output queue which communicates with a printer while Fax jobs are

delivered to a hold queue which communicates with the output queue. In practice, after

a certain number of Fax jobs have accumulated in the hold queue, they are delivered to

the output queue in such a manner that the Fax jobs are printed ahead of all jobs

currently residing in the output queue (Column 3, lines 22 – 32), which provide for **said**

satellite servers are configured to store accumulated jobs.

11.   **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Rourke et al. do not explicitly teach **off-peak**

time period. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to interpret the invention of Rourke et al. as providing for **said**

satellite servers are configured to pass the accumulated jobs to said central

server during at least one off-peak time period, since Rourke et al. do teach that

while only one server and a limited number of document processing apparatuses are

shown in FIG. 1, the preferred embodiment contemplates the use of as many servers

and document processing units as required to meet the demands of the users of the

system (Column 6, line 65 – Column 7, line 2). The skilled artisan can interpret that the

invention of Rourke et al. would only need to employ the one server during an off-peak

time period, since the demands of the users would be extremely low.

12.   **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Rourke et al. teach that *individual ones or all of*

clients may have a document scanner, disk input, keyboard, fax, etc. (Column 7, lines 4

– 6), which provides for **said input sources include at least one of a scanner and a**

personal computer.

13.   **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Rourke et al. teach that *in one example,*

electronic document(s), which includes image and attribute related information, is

transmitted from the client to the server (Column 7, lines 29 – 31), which provide for **at least one said digital file comprises an electronic image**.

14.   **Regarding independent claim 12 and dependent claim 13**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale.

15.   **Regarding dependent claim 14**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

16.   **Regarding dependent claim 15**, Rourke et al. illustrate in Fig. 1 (15-N) **an administrative client for at least one of configuring and monitoring said server**.

17.   Claims 6 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Senn et al. (US006151610A).

18.   **Regarding independent claim 6**, Senn et al. teach that *any paper document can be entered into the system by scanning* (Column 3, lines 66 – 67), which provides for **scanning a document with a scanner to thereby obtain the digital file**. Senn et al. also teach *a document management apparatus has a scripting language which controls documents by setting the attributes of documents. Attributes are pieces of data within a document. A script engine reads a script from a cache memory and launches the processes to accomplish the desired action of the script* (Column 1, lines 33 – 40). Senn et al. do not explicitly teach **job object** or **action object**. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the invention of Senn et al. to provide for **building a job object including a plurality of**

action objects; and performing the action objects on the digital file, since the

skilled artisan would interpret *setting the attributes of a document* as a **job object** and

the *processes to accomplish it* as a **plurality of action objects**.

19.   **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Senn et al. teach that *as an alternative, an*

identifier process can be designed and used to determine whether the value of an

attribute is script, and also what script interpreter is needed to interpret it. The identifier

process does not test whether the script can be properly parsed, but upon determining

that the value of an attribute is script, chooses which script interpreter to call to interpret

the script (Column 3, lines 19 – 25), which provide that **said building step is**

performed by a parser.

20.   **Regarding dependent claim 8**, Senn et al. teach that *upon determining that the*

value of an attribute is script, chooses which script interpreter to call to interpret the

script. For example, the identifier process can select an interpreter for a dialect of the

LISP programming language by checking the first non-whitespace character to see if it

is a left parenthesis or single-quote. If the first non-whitespace character is a left

parenthesis of a single-quote, the identifier process selects the interpreter for the dialect

of the LISP programming language to interpret the script (Column 3, lines 24 – 31),

which provides that **said building step is dependent upon a plurality of script**

settings.

21.   **Regarding dependent claim 9**, Senn et al. teach that *the expression, dump*

"concatenate" & "these" & "strings" prints "concatenate these strings" to the computer

display device (Column 33, lines 58 – 61), which provide that **said action objects include at least one of printing, emailing and faxing**.

22.   **Regarding dependent claim 10**, Senn et al. teach that *locals are containers that exist only for the duration of a thread of execution and are local to that thread. Since threads often execute in parallel in the scripting language, it is usually appropriate to use locals to store temporary results within a thread* (Column 33, lines 10 – 14), which provide that **said performing step includes assigning said action objects to individual worker threads**.

23.   **Regarding dependent claim 11**, Senn et al. teach that *each client module may then access the repositories 142 to retrieve those permanent attributes, convert the permanent attributes to ephemeral attributes, and update the local display* (Column 20, lines 64 – 67), which provide that **said performing step includes requesting at least one action module**.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (703) 305-4502. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

NH